

BEFORE THE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

STATE OF WASHINGTON

DONNA WELLS,

Appellant,

v.

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL AND HEALTH  
SERVICES,

Respondent.

Case No. ALLO-00-0023

ORDER OF THE BOARD FOLLOWING  
HEARING ON EXCEPTIONS TO THE  
DETERMINATION OF THE DIRECTOR

**Hearing on Exceptions.** This appeal came on for hearing before the Personnel Appeals Board, WALTER T. HUBBARD, Chair, and LEANA LAMB, Member, on Appellant's exceptions to the Director's determination dated May 31, 2000. The hearing was held at the office of the Personnel Appeals Board in Olympia, Washington, on April 3, 2001. GERALD L. MORGEN, Vice Chair, did not participate in the hearing or decision in this matter.

**Appearances.** Appellant Donna Wells was present and appeared *pro se*. Respondent Department of Social and Health Services was represented by George Weirich, Classification and Compensation Supervising Manager.

**Background.** As a result of a class study, Appellant's former position as a Human Resource Development Specialist 2 was reallocated down to the class of Human Resource Consultant Assistant effective July 1, 1999. By letter dated July 16, 1999, Appellant appealed this determination to the director of the Department of Personnel asking that her position be reallocated to the class of Human Resource Consultant 3. On March 22, 2000, Paul Peterson, Personnel

1 Hearings Officer, conducted an allocation review and by letter dated May 31, 2000, he informed  
2 Appellant that her position was properly allocated to the Human Resource Consultant Assistant  
3 classification. On June 28, 2000, Appellant filed exceptions to the determination of the Department  
4 of Personnel. Appellant's exceptions are the subject of these proceedings.

5  
6 Appellant works for the Region 2 Division of Development Disabilities (DDD) and she is directly  
7 supervised by a Developmental Disabilities Administrator. Appellant's responsibilities for DDD  
8 Region 2 include overseeing the training program for approximately 350 employees working for the  
9 Administration division, Yakima Valley School, Field Services and the State Operated Living  
10 Alternatives (SOLA) Program.

11  
12 **Summary of Appellant's Argument.** Appellant argues that her position should be allocated to  
13 the Human Resource Consultant 2 or 3 class. Appellant contends that although she works out of the  
14 Yakima Valley School (YVS), her position is not a part of, nor under the responsibility of, anyone  
15 at YVS. Appellant contends that the director's designee failed to review her CQ and that he failed  
16 to consider the time frames she listed and the training hours she performed for a six-month period  
17 from January 1, 1999 through June 30, 1999. Appellant contends that she performed employee  
18 training for a significantly higher amount of time than the 12 percent of time stated by the designee.  
19 Appellant contends that her professional responsibilities include her role as the designated Region 2  
20 DDD Special Diversity Initiatives Coordinator, including the Native American Work Plan and the  
21 Minority Affairs and Disability and Sexual Orientation Initiative. Appellant asserts that she  
22 interprets and applies the laws, rules and policies to ensure that all regulations and policies related  
23 to employee training are implemented and in compliance with the necessary requirements.

24  
25 **Summary of Respondent's Argument.** Respondent argues that Appellant's position is properly  
26 allocated to the Human Resource Consultant Assistant classification and that her duties do not rise

1 to the requirements found in the Human Resource Consultant 1, 2 or 3 levels. Respondent argues  
2 that Appellant's duties are paraprofessional and technical in nature and that her position lacks the  
3 level of authority and scope of work encompassed by the professional classes. Respondent  
4 acknowledges that the amount of time Appellant spends performing training, not including  
5 orientations, is professional in nature. However, Respondent asserts that Appellant performs this  
6 duty for less than 12 percent of her work time and therefore, it does not constitute a majority of her  
7 time. Respondent contends that much of Appellant's work is not original work because items such  
8 as the Diversity Workplan, the Minority Affairs Initiative and the American Indian Policy were  
9 written at the DDD Headquarters level.

10  
11 **Primary Issue.** Whether the director's determination that Appellant's position is properly allocated  
12 to the Human Resource Consultant Assistant classification should be affirmed.

13  
14 **Relevant Classifications.** Human Resource Consultant Assistant, class code 19101; Human  
15 Resource Consultant 2, class code 19103; and Human Resource Consultant 3, class code 19104.

16  
17 **Decision of the Board.** The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification best  
18 describes the overall duties and responsibilities of a position. A position review is neither a  
19 measurement of the volume of work performed, nor an evaluation of the expertise with which that  
20 work is performed. Also, a position review is not a comparison of work performed by employees in  
21 similar positions. A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a particular  
22 position to the available classification specifications. This review results in a determination of the  
23 class which best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position. Liddle-Stamper v.  
24 Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

1 Appellant's CQ reflects that 70 percent of her duties include "planning, developing, coordinating,  
2 structuring, revising, implementing, monitoring and/or evaluating Region 2's human resource  
3 development training plan." Appellant sets up the training room and arranges for and schedules the  
4 trainers and she sends reminders and confirmation notices to attendees. Appellant monitors  
5 employee training, maintains employee training records, and ensures that employees attend  
6 requisite training. Appellant is responsible for maintaining the DDD Region 2 human resource  
7 development information system to ensure staff training records are up-to-date. Twenty-five  
8 percent of Appellant's duties include conducting new employee orientation, providing career  
9 counseling to employees and revising and updating the regional training policies and procedures.  
10 On occasion, Appellant conducts a training session herself.

11  
12 The Human Resource Consultant 2 and 3 classifications encompass complex, professional-level  
13 duties and responsibilities. Examples of professional-level duties and responsibilities include, but  
14 are not limited to classification and compensation, recruitment, selection, affirmative action,  
15 diversity, staff and leadership development and training, career counseling, interpretation and  
16 application of laws, rules policies and procedures, etc.

17  
18 At the Human Resource Consultant 2 level, incumbents consult with and provide assistance to  
19 managers and employees regarding human resource issues and work at an experienced professional  
20 level under the general guidance of a higher level human resource professional or manager. Their  
21 work is complex rather than routine. At the Human Resource Consultant 3 level, incumbents are  
22 independent senior professionals who are skilled and experienced as senior-level human resource  
23 consultants/advisors. They work under minimal supervision with responsibility for resolving  
24 complex or difficult human resource issues having broad potential impact. The majority of  
25 Appellant's duties and her level of responsibility don't rise to the level encompassed by the Human  
26 Resource Consultant 2 or 3 levels.

1  
2 At the Human Resource Consultant Assistant level, incumbents perform a variety of  
3 paraprofessional or technical duties in one or more human resource areas as human resource support  
4 to management and staff. Examples of paraprofessional or technical responsibilities typically  
5 assigned include, but are not limited to interpreting rules and policies and explaining human  
6 resource policies, procedures and programs; providing guidance to others in registering or applying  
7 for human resource programs; providing training or orientation in an area of assigned responsibility,  
8 etc.

9  
10 Although Appellant performs some professional level duties, such as the occasion training session  
11 she may conduct, the majority of her responsibilities are paraprofessional and technical in nature.  
12 The primary focus of Appellant's duties and responsibilities involve coordinating staff training and  
13 providing information regarding career development and training opportunities. Appellant  
14 maintains computerized data on employee training history and she forwards copies of the human  
15 resource development information to the Department of Personnel for input into an employee's  
16 permanent training record. These duties and responsibilities are best described as paraprofessional  
17 and clearly fall within definition and distinguishing characteristics of the Human Resource  
18 Consultant Assistant classification.

19  
20 Appellant has failed to establish that the work she performs meets the definition or the  
21 distinguishing characteristics necessary for her position to be allocated to the Human Resource  
22 Consultant 2 or 3 classification.

23  
24 **Conclusion.** The appeal on exceptions by Appellant should be denied and the Director's  
25 determination dated May 31, 2000, should be affirmed and adopted.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

**ORDER**

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by Appellant is denied and the attached Director’s determination dated May 31, 2000, is affirmed and adopted.

DATED this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2001.

WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

\_\_\_\_\_  
Walter T. Hubbard, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Leana D. Lamb, Member